

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application, as currently amended, in light of the following remarks.

In this reply, Applicant amends claims 1, 5, 12, 20, and 21. Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-21 are currently pending. The changes to the claims find non-limiting support in the originally-filed application, at least from page 26, line 25, to page 28, line 13, and in Figs. 6 and 7. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,487, "Maeda") in view of Bodnar (U.S. Patent No. 6,544,295, "Bodnar"); and claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Bodnar, and further in view of Funaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,707,471, "Funaki").

Applicant amends independent claim 1 to recite that "when there is an input to operate the OK button, the inputted setting of the image forming condition is enabled and a shortcut button is displayed on the initial screen" and that "all of the short cut buttons for redisplaying setting screens on which image forming conditions were set are displayed in a list on the initial screen." Along the same lines, Applicant amends independent claim 12 to recite "when the input to operate the OK button is received, enabling the inputted setting of the image forming condition and displaying a shortcut button on the initial screen" and "displaying all of the short cut buttons for redisplaying setting screens on which image forming conditions were set in a list on the initial screen." Applicant submits that Maeda and Bodnar, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features.

First, Applicant submits that Maeda and Bodnar fail to teach or suggest that “when there is an input to operate the OK button, the inputted setting of the image forming condition is enabled and a shortcut button is displayed on the initial screen,” as recited in claim 1, and “when the input to operate the OK button is received, enabling the inputted setting of the image forming condition and displaying a shortcut button on the initial screen,” as recited in claim 12.

Maeda, as conceded at page 3 of the Office Action “does not explicitly disclose the setting screen includes an OK button for enabling the setting of the image forming condition.” Bodnar relates to “methods for managing a user’s own preferred Internet sites” (c. 1, ll. 18-19) and teaches that a user “clicks OK” in a dialog box to create an Internet shortcut icon that “appears on the user’s desktop” (c. 11, ll. 25-45). However, even if whatever Bodnar’s user clicks were construed as an “OK button,” *arguendo*, Bodnar fails to teach or suggest that when there is an input to operate the OK button, “the inputted setting of the image forming condition is enabled,” as recited in claim 1, and “enabling the inputted setting of the image forming condition,” as recited in claim 12. To that effect, Applicant submits that while Bodnar relates to the field of Internet shortcuts management, it does not relate in any way to the image forming apparatus field of the present invention and, in particular, does not relate to or mention any image forming condition in an image forming apparatus, much less one associated with an OK button. Moreover, whatever Bodnar’s user clicks to create the Internet shortcut is not included in a “setting screen to receive an input of setting an image forming condition,” as recited in claim 1. Rather, Bodnar’s user must right-click on a website in the user’s

Internet browser and then select “Internet Shortcut” from a pop-up menu (see c. 11, ll. 26-28).

The Office Action asserts at page 3 that Bodnar “discloses an OK button for creating a shortcut represented by an icon on an initial screen” and that “it would have been obvious . . . to include an OK button for enabling the setting of the image forming condition inputted in Maeda, because including an OK button was recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. Even if it were the case that “including an OK button” were “recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art,” *arguendo*, that would be inconsequential because claims 1 and 12 recite not solely an “OK button,” but an “OK button *for enabling the setting of the image forming condition inputted on the setting screen,*” and “receiving an input to operate an OK button so as *to enable the setting of the image forming condition inputted on the setting screen,*” respectively, which Bodnar does not teach or suggest.

Second, Applicant submits that Maeda and Bodnar fail to teach or suggest that “all of the short cut buttons for redisplaying setting screens on which image forming conditions were set are displayed in a list on the initial screen,” as recited in claim 1, and “displaying all of the short cut buttons for redisplaying setting screens on which image forming conditions were set in a list on the initial screen,” as recited in claim 12.

To that effect, Applicant notes that while Maeda discloses “shortcut keys,” those keys are respectively allocated to a plurality of screens (see Figs. 2, 5C, 8, 9, 12, 14, and 16-18) and are thus not “all . . . displayed in a list on the initial screen” as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 12.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Maeda and Bodnar, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the features of amended independent claims 1 and 12, and thus that none of claims 1 and 12, nor any of their dependent claims, are unpatentable over Maeda and Bodnar. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-19 as being unpatentable over Maeda and Bodnar.

With regard to dependent claims 20 and 21, Applicant submits that Funaki also fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned features of amended independent claims 1 and 12 not taught or suggested by Maeda and Bodnar. Accordingly, Maeda, Bodnar, and Funaki, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the features of claims 1 and 12, from which claims 20 and 21 depend, and thus claims 20 and 21 are not unpatentable over Maeda, Bodnar, and Funaki. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 20 and 21 as being unpatentable over Maeda, Bodnar, and Funaki.

Finally, because the Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and background art with which Applicant does not necessarily agree, Applicant declines to subscribe to any such characterizations unless expressly set forth in this reply.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 26, 2008

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220
(571) 203-2735